

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 11, 12, 18, 21 – 25, 37, 47, 68 – 74, 76 – 82 remain in this application. Claims 1-10, 13-17, 19-20, 26-36, 38-46, 48-67, and 75 have been canceled.

1. Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

Applicants thank the examiner for the acknowledgement of the Request for Continued Examination filed October 24, 2007.

2. Drawings

Applicants note the Examiner has not indicated in the accompanying form PTO-326 that the formal drawings previously submitted have been approved. However without specific rejection, Applicants will assume they have been approved.

3. Allowed Claims/Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated the subject matter of claims 11, 12, 18, 21 – 25, 37, 47, 68 – 74, and 76 – 81 are allowed. However, Applicants point out that claim 82 was previously presented but not referred to in the Office Action. Applicants believe claim 82 is patentable as dependent upon an allowable base claim, and respectfully request that claim 82 be accepted as allowable over the prior art.

4. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claim 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable for obviousness over Pilcher et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,911,667 of record, and in view of Hudecek, et al (US Patent No. 6,245,699) and Higo, et al (JP 2000-086286).

The Examiner asserts that Pichler teaches an encapsulated organic diode, that Higo teaches a glass composition comprised of, in part, a frit doped with at least one transition metal and a coefficient of thermal expansion lowering filler comprising no more than about 30% of the frit, that Hudecek teaches the claimed particle size, and that

Higo and Hudecek do so for the purpose of improving the strength of the frit composition. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the frit combination of Higo and Hudecek in the encapsulation of the organic diode of Pichler for the purpose of improving the strength of the frit composition.

Applicants respectfully disagree. However, the question is moot. In the interest of expediting allowance, Applicants have canceled claim 75.

5. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of record, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and a prompt Notice of Allowance thereon

Applicants believe that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorize the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Kevin M. Able at 607-974-2637.

2/11/08
Date

| CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 | |
|---|------------------------|
| I hereby certify that this paper and any papers referred to herein are being transmitted by First Class Mail to Mail Stop: Amendment, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: | |
| <u>2/11/2008</u> <u>Lindsay J. Casbeer</u> Lindsay J. Casbeer | <u>2/11/08</u> Date |

Respectfully submitted,
CORNING INCORPORATED

Kevin M. Able
Kevin M. Able
Registration No. 52,401
Corning Incorporated
Patent Department
Mail Stop SP-TI-03-1
Corning, NY 14831